UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,970	02/27/2004	Arkady Borkovsky	50269-0569	6826
73066 7590 03/17/2008 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP/Yahoo! Inc. 2055 Gateway Place Suite 550 San Jose, CA 95110-1083			EXAMINER	
			LIN, SHEW FEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/788,970	BORKOVSKY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SHEW-FEN LIN	2166	

ontinuation Sheet (PTOL-303)	Application No.
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with	
THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	ON FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Noti application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, a application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compl for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be periods:	ffidavit, or other evidence, which places the liance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date se no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	mailing date of the final rejection. EN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 C have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding at under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for repset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	mount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee oly originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 mu filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth AMENDMENTS	(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (se (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materia appeal; and/or	ally reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of fina NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	illy rejected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of No.	on-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a sepanon-allowable claim(s). 	arate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	will be entered and an explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filin because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented.	appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a ed. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims a REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the applicat Regarding to applicant's argument that Gravano's approach does not search for any documentsonly those that are already in the dictionary. The Examiner respectfully of the terms on the identified linked-to documents base on dictionary as (receiving a sterms in a first language; performing a search of documents in the first language to log documents that contain anchor text that matches the search query and identifies one determining possible translations of the terms of the search query into the second languagements as parallel corpora for disambiguation among the possible translations of one of the possible translations as a correct translation of the search query based on	translations that exist in the linked-to disagreed. Gravano search the translations search query that includes one or more ocate one or more of the first language or more documents in a second language; aguage; using the identified second language the terms of the search query; identifying
search of second language documents using the correct translation of the search que	

Regarding to applicant's argument that combination of Gravano and Weiss still would not search for any candidate alternative spellings that existed in the linked-to documents--only those that were

already in the dictionary (per Gravano) or the database (per Weiss). The Examiner respectfully disagreed. Applicant is reminded that the Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.'

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case, "spelled similarly to, but not exactly the same" is such a broad term, and any criteria specified in the dictionary can be used to obtain "all" similar spellings. In addition, Weiss teaches using a fuzzy search on the database